

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed July 1, 2009, has been received and the Examiner's comments carefully reviewed. Claims 1-23 are rejected. Claims 1, 11 and 18 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-8, 10, 11-16, 18-21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sprint Online User's Guide PCS Phone Handspring Treo 300 User Guide, known hereinafter as Treo in view of Grossman et al. (U.S. patent No. 2004/0119732 A 1); Microsoft Middleeast - Windows XP; and Nicolas et al. (U.S. patent No. 7,551,899). Claims 9, 17, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sprint Online User's Guide PCS Phone Handspring Treo 300 User Guide, known hereinafter as Treo in view of Grossman et al.; Microsoft Middleeast - Windows XP; and Nicolas et al. as applied to claims 1-8, 10, 11-16, 18-21, and 23 above and in further view of SoloMio.

With regard to Claim 1, the Office Action recites that Treo teaches "determining a recent item from recently accessed items on a device; wherein the recently accessed items on the device include: recent incoming phone calls; recent outgoing phone calls; and recent access of contacts (see page 94, Reviewing Call History); ... placing the recent item in a recent items list that includes all recently accessed items (see page 94, screen shot); generating the recent items list such that recent items associated with a contact are coalesced and shown as only one item within the recent items list; wherein the recent items list includes both recent items that were replaced by a contact and recent items that were not replaced by a contact (see page 94, screen shot, where each incoming outgoing or missed call is only displayed once); and displaying the recent items list (see page 94, screen shot); and displaying a context menu when the recent item is selected; wherein the context menu includes: in response to determining the recent item was not replaced by a contact, an option to create a new contact for the recent item (see page 95, "Adding a Call History entry to your Contacts list", "3. Under Record, select Add (/N)"); an option to an option to remove the recent item from the recent items list (see page 107, Call History view). ... Treo as modified, still does not distinctly disclose generating the recent items list such that recent items

associated with a contact are coalesced and shown as only one item. Nicolas et al. teaches this, see column 5, line 52 through column 6, line 5; see column 6, lines 26-50; and see 30-55, "most used numbers" lists contacts with one number based on the amount of times that number has called or been called, when doing the number search over all the tables, line 46 of column 7 teaches removing all duplicates. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Treo as modified to include the teachings of Nicolas et al. because this would remove redundant data so that it is easier for users to make a selection that is desired. Further, Nicolas et al. was meant to be performed on a device similar to a Treo." In response, Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the invention.

As amended, Claim 1 recites in part "displaying non-recently accessed contacts after the displayed list of recent items; and in response to selecting the recent item, displaying a context menu; wherein the context menu includes: in response to determining the recent item was not replaced by a contact, an option to create a new contact for the recent item; in response to determining the recent item was replaced by a contact, an option to pin a selected contact displayed in the recent items list; an option to beam the recent item; an option to remove the recent item from the recent items list; and an option to view a call history for the recent item that is selected." Among other differences, the cited references fail to teach displaying non-recently accessed contacts after the list of the recent items or that a call history for the recent item is accessible through a context menu for the recent item.

In contrast, the Treo reference teaches displaying a list of all of the calls that are made and received using the device regardless of whether they are from/to the same telephone number. Further, the Treo reference does not teach that non-recent contacts are displayed beneath the list of recent contacts. The addition of the other cited references fail to cure these deficiencies. For example, the Nicolas reference only teaches that duplicates may be removed before being displayed to the user. The Nicolas reference and the other cited references also fail to teach that a context menu is used to view a call history for the selected recent contact. Further, the cited references fail to teach that a context menu is displayed in response to selecting a recent item within the list. Instead, the Treo reference teaches that an add option is always displayed beneath

the items displayed within the call history. This is not the same as displaying a context menu in response to a selection of a recent item. For at least the reasons presented above, Claim 1 is proposed to be allowable. Applicants respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn for Claims 2-10 because they depend from a valid base claim.

As amended, Claim 11 recites in part “determining a recent item from recently accessed items; wherein the recently accessed items include: recent incoming phone calls; recent outgoing phone calls; recently received electronic messages; recent outgoing electronic messages; recent access of contacts; recent incoming SMS messages; recent outgoing SMS messages; recent incoming IM messages; recent outgoing IM messages; recently accessed files and recently accessed applications; ...displaying non-recently accessed contacts after the displayed list of recent items; and in response to selection of a recent item, displaying a context menu, wherein an option in the context menu depends on whether a selected recent item is replaced by a contact.” In addition to the arguments presented above, the cited references fail to show that the recent items list includes recently accessed files, applications, SMS messages and IM messages. For at least this reason and the reasons presented above, Claim 11 is proposed to be allowable. Applicants respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn for Claims 12-17 because they depend from a valid base claim.

As amended, Claim 18 recites in part “generating the recent items list such that recent items associated with a contact are coalesced and shown as only one item; and wherein a recent item related to a pinned contact is pinned to the top of the recent items list; displaying the recent items list; and displaying non-recently accessed contacts after the displayed list of recent items.” For at least the reasons presented above, Claim 18 is proposed to be allowable. Applicants respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn for Claims 19-23 because they depend from a valid base claim.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application,

the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned agent for the applicant at the telephone number provided below.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
206.342.6200



Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

/Timothy P. Sullivan/
Timothy P. Sullivan
Reg. No. 47,981
Direct Dial 206.342.6254